



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virguina 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	Α	TTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,186 04/19/2001		Matthew L. Meyerson		7032/2002	- 1540	
29933	7590	07/16/2004			EXAM	INER
PALMER & DODGE, LLP					ALLEN, MARIANNE P	
KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS 111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE					ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				L_		
BOSTON, MA 02199					1631	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/839,186	MEYERSON, MATTHEW L.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Marianne P. Allen	1631			

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	(a) a simoly mad residuot for committee
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) of	or b)]
 a)	m the mailing date of the final rejection.
706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition use have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresperse under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory perion (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months a timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	conding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension od for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed wit 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid di	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or	r search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal issues for appeal; and/or	al by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding nu	ımber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation	on Sheet.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ted in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has b application in condition for allowance because:	een considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	SOLELY to issues which were newly
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entexplanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the control of the con	• • •
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-26,29-31,50,51,53-58 and 60-64</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved or b)	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	er No(s)
10.⊠ Other:	
-	Mpsiame P. Who
	Marianne P. Allen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1631

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendments substantively amend the claims and would require further search and consideration with respect to applicable prior art and enablement. Note that the goal of the method has changed significantly and no longer requires determining the presence of a microbe in a host organism (see independent claims). In addition, the proposed claims introduce or do not overcome 112, 2nd paragraph issues. For example, claim 4 compares the candidate sequence to a database of microbial sequences and concludes that the presence of the candidate sequence identifies a symbiotic microbial organism; however, the database in question does not need to be from a symbiotic microbial organism. It could contain sequences from a pathogenic microorganism or include multiple microorganisms. See also claims 5-6. For example, claim 8 continues to require pre-knowledge of the microbe in the host organism as being an intracellular pathogen before the method is executed. For example, claim 17 states that the host organism is a microorganism yet the preambles of claims 1, 2, and 3 specifically exclude microbial host organisms.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Basis is seen for the limitation "20 consecutive nucleotides" and would overcome the portion of the enablement rejection concerning matching.